APPLICATION RATING FORM

Reviewer's Identification Nu	mber:	_ (no name pleas	e)
Date:			
Principal Investigator(s):			
Proposal Number:			
Application Title:			
Section A. Summary of Ratin	ngs:		
Please complete the question	s below and th	en fill in this summar	y.
Statement 1. Objectives 2. Achievability 3. Methodology 4. Contribution 5. Awareness 6. Background 7. Project Management 8. Equipment Purchase 9. Facilities 10. Budget	Circled Number XXXXXX	Weighting Factor 9 9 7 7 5 5 2 2 2 2 Total: 50	Subrating = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
Note: While points are neces criteria are critical to truly un in the comment sections to the	derstanding th	e value of a proposed	
Overall Recommendation:		Fund Funding May Be Con Do Not Fund	sidered

Section B. Ratings and Comments:

Please circle your response to each statement and transfer the number circled to the column entitled "Circled Number" on the first page of this form. Also, please comment on each criteria.

1. The objectives or goals of the proposed project with respect to clarity and consistency with North Dakota Industrial Commission/Oil and Gas Research Council goals are: 1 – very unclear; 2 – unclear; 3 – clear; 4 – very clear; or 5 – exceptionally clear.

Please comment:


2. With the approach suggested and time and budget available, the objectives are: 1 – not achievable; 2 – possibly achievable; 3 – likely achievable; 4 – most likely achievable; or 5 – certainly achievable.

Please comment:

3.	The quality of the methodology displayed in the proposal is: 1 – well below average; 2 – below average; 3 – average; 4 – above average; or 5 – well above average.
	Please comment:
4.	The scientific and/or technical contribution of the proposed work to specifically address North Dakota Industrial Commission/Oil and Gas Research Council goals will likely be: 1 – extremely small; 2 – small; 3 – significant; 4 – very significant; or 5 – extremely significant.
	Please comment:

5.	The principal investigator's awareness of current research activity and published literature as evidenced by literature referenced and its interpretation and by the reference to unpublished research related to the proposal is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.
	Please comment:
6.	The background of the investigator(s) as related to the proposed work is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.
	Please comment:

7.	The project management plan, including a well-defined milestone chart, schedule,
	financial plan, and plan for communications among the investigators and subcontractors, if any, is: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – very good; or 5 – exceptionally good.
	Please comment:
8.	The proposed purchase of equipment is: 1 – extremely poorly justified; 2 – poorly justified; 3 – justified; 4 – well justified; or 5 – extremely well justified. (Circle 5 if no equipment is to be purchased.)
	Please comment:



Section C. Overall Comments and Recommendations:

Please comment in a general way about the merits and flaws of the proposed project and make a recommendation whether or not to fund.

General comments: